Remarks/Arguments

The amendments set forth herein are provided solely to clarify the invention as filed and set forth in the pending claims in order to comply with applicable statutes and regulations. The amendments are not intended to limit the invention or preclude the application of equivalents which Applicant may be entitled to under law.

Status of the Application

Claims 1-13 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Melchior (USP 6,226,710) in view of Hariguchi '855 (USP 6,307,855) and Hariguchi '946 (USP 6,717,946). Claims 14-22 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Melchior in view of Hariguchi '946.

Claim rejections, 35 USC 103(a)

The claim rejections of claims 1-13 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Melchior in view of Hariguchi '855 and Hariguchi '946 have been overcome in part and are traversed in part. Independent claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations previously expressed in claims 2-10, and claims 2-10 have been canceled as now being redundant.

Amended claim 1 contains teaching not taught by any combination of Malchior, Hariguchi '855, or Hariguchi '946. Specifically, the combination of these citations does not teach an action group arbitration system that uses the combination SRAM and TCAM searchable memory block system that provides action indication search results in response to a search key per the limitations of amended claim 1. In fact, none of the citations even teaches that SRAM and TCAM can be combined to form the type of search block taught by amended claim 1.

For example, although Melchior teaches a content addressable memory that uses RAM, or SRAM, Melchior's purpose is different (Melchior teaches a memory controller, while the present disclosure teaches an action group arbitration system). Further, the organization of Melchior's system is considerably different from the organization of the system taught by amended present claim 1 and 14.

Similarly, although Hariguchi '855 teaches a routing table that uses content addressable memory, Hariguchi '855 uses only CAM in his system. See for example, Hariguchi '855 figure 3. Hariguchi '855 fails to teach the mixed TCAM and SRAM system taught by the present system in which both TCAM and SRAM contain a plurality of entries configured to provide a search result in response to a search key.

In the same manner, Hariguchi '946 teaches another different system in which both TCAM and SRAM are involved (as per Hariguchi figure 1A), note that the purpose and organization of Hariguchi's system is completely different from the present art. In the present art, TCAM and SRAM both function together in parallel to, for example, analyze a packet and determine what actions to take with the packet (as per present figure 2 and figure 3).

No combination of Melichior, Hariguchi '855, or Hariguchi '896, for example, teaches the parallel TCAM SRAM configuration shown in present figures 2-5, which in turn is captured by presently amended claims 1 and 14 and dependent claim 26.

No new material has been added. In addition to finding support in original claims 2-10 (which can be brought into the specification by amendment if the examiner determines that this step is needed), amended claim 1 also finds support in specification figures 2, 3, 4 (which show this combined SRAM and TCAM searchable memory block system graphically), as well as specification paragraphs [0017] – [0026]. Support for the new limitation: "and wherein the first type memory portion and the second type memory

portion operate in parallel to provide search results" can be found in specification paragraphs [0017], [0019], [0026] and figures 2, 3, 4 and 5.

The rejection of claims 11-13 is also respectfully overcome in part and traversed in part. These claims are dependent claims to claim 1, and thus inherit the present claim 1 limitations, which are not taught by any combination of Malchior, Hariguchi '855, or Hariguchi '946.

The claim rejections of claims 14-22 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Melchior in view of Hariguchi '946 have been overcome in part and are traversed in part. Independent claim 14 has been amended to incorporate the limitations previously expressed in claims 15-21, and claims 15-21 have been canceled as now being redundant. Claim 22 has also been canceled.

As discussed in more detail in the response to claim 1, amended claim 14 contains teaching not taught by any combination of Malchior or Hariguchi '946. As per the claim 1 discussion, the combination of the Malichior and Hariguchi '946 citations do not teach an action group arbitration system that uses the parallel combination SRAM and TCAM searchable memory block system that provides action indication search results in response to a search key per the limitations of amended claim 14. In fact, none of the citations even teaches that SRAM and TCAM can be combined to form a parallel searchable memory block, as taught by amended claim 14.

No new material has been added. In addition to finding support in original claims 15-21 (which can be brought into the specification by amendment if the examiner determines that this step is needed), amended claim 14 (as per amended claim 1) also finds support in specification figures 2, 3, 4 (which show this combined SRAM and TCAM searchable memory block system graphically), as well as specification paragraphs [0017] – [0026].

New claims:

New independent claim 23 is essentially amended claim 1 combined with dependent claim 11. As previously discussed, amended claim 1 is a combination of original claim 1 and original dependent claims 2-10). New dependent claims 24, 25 and 27 find support in original claims 12 and 13. New dependent claim 26 finds support in specification paragraphs [0017], [0019], [0026] and figures 2, 3, 4 and 5.

Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application; the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 16, 2007

/David R. Stevens/
David R. Stevens
Reg. No. 38,626

Stevens Law Group
P.O. Box 1667
San Jose, CA 95109
Tel (408) 288-7588
Fax (408) 288-7542